

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application.

The support for the amendment to Claim 13 is found in FIGs. 1, 3, and 4.

Claims 21-27 are newly added. The support for Claims 21-27 is found in FIGs. 3 and 4.

It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Specification

The paragraph spanning pages 3 and 4 has been replaced so as to make the typographical correction of a part number. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added and respectfully requested that the Patent Office withdraw the objection to the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and 103

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-12 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Levine, U.S. Patent No. 5,692,214.

A claim is anticipated by a reference if each and every element of the claim is taught by the reference or the element is inherent. MPEP 2131.

Claims 1-12 recite "while receiving information from a selected information source, monitoring event related information for an occurrence of the event."

Levine does not teach or suggest the monitoring step occurs while information is being received. Levine also does not teach or suggest an information source that has been selected that provides the information received. Levine's assertion in col. 3, lines 64-66, "The operator of the personal computer system 18 may communicate with the

schedule source over phone lines 42 using modems 44 at each end” does not disclose or suggest the step of monitoring occurring while information is being received nor that a selected information source is providing the information.

Therefore, claims 1-12 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Furthermore, Claims 5 and 11 recite “said registering step including registering the application with an electronic program guide.”

Levine, in col. 3, lines 49-50, asserts “The application program is loaded into the personal computer via a diskette or the like.” This is not a teaching or suggestion that registering step includes registering the application with an electronic program guide.

Therefore, claims 5 and 11 are allowable for this additional reason.

The Patent Office rejected Claims 13-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lawler et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,585,838.

The Patent Office rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,585,838.

The Patent Office is kindly reminded that in order to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant’s disclosure. MPEP § 2142.

Claim 13 has been amended. It is believed that amended Claim 13 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 21-27 have been added to further define applicant's invention and are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, amendments and supporting arguments, reconsideration of all pending claims is requested, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
GATEWAY, INC.,

By: Walter J. Malinowski
Walter Malinowski
Reg. No. 43,423

SUITER · WEST PC LLO
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220
Omaha, Nebraska 68154
Telephone 402.496.0300
Facsimile 402.496.0333